

The Federal Magistrates Act of 1979, as amended, provides that “a district court shall make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the report or specific proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 200 (4th Cir.1983). However, “when objections to strictly legal issues are raised and no factual issues are challenged, *de novo* review of the record may be dispensed with.” Orpiano v. Johnson, 687 F.2d 44, 47 (4th Cir. 1982). Similarly, *de novo* review is not required by the statute “when a party makes general or conclusory objections that do not direct the court to a specific error in the magistrate judge’s proposed findings and recommendations.” Id. Moreover, the statute does not on its face require any review at all of issues that are not the subject of an objection. Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985); Camby, 718 F.2d at 200. Nonetheless, a district judge


is responsible for the final determination and outcome of the case, and accordingly the court has conducted a careful review of the magistrate judge's recommendation.

After such careful review, the court determines that the recommendation of the magistrate judge is fully consistent with and supported by current law. Further, the brief factual background and recitation of issues is supported by the applicable pleadings. Specifically, the court finds that the magistrate judge's determination that Plaintiff's claims for race and color discrimination are subject to dismissal because Plaintiff failed to exhaust her administrative remedies is fully supported by governing law. The court also agrees with the magistrate judge's determinations as to the 12(b)(6) analysis for Plaintiff's discrimination claims, the matter of untimeliness of Plaintiff's complaint, and the service issues identified by the magistrate judge as to Defendant Iona Ivey. Based on such determinations, and the fact that no party has filed objections, the court will fully affirm the Memorandum and Recommendation and grant relief in accordance therewith.

### **ORDER**

**IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED** that the Memorandum and Recommendation (#21) is **AFFIRMED**, Defendant's Motion to Dismiss (#11) is **GRANTED**, and this action is **DISMISSED** as to all Defendants.

Signed: October 21, 2015



Max O. Cogburn Jr.  
United States District Judge